
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3372959

15 Chicheley Gardens, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 6QH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by J Coroli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2014/25.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The name of the person making the appeal in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form, which has been confirmed as being correct.

Background and Main Issue

3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3)(b) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development. On this basis, it is the Council's view that the developer has failed to provide consistent information in relation to the height of the proposal and so the maximum height of the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse has not been provided, as required by GPDO paragraph A.4(2)(a)(ii).
5. Consequently, the main issue is whether the proposal would be granted planning permission by Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons

6. GPDO paragraph A.4(2) states that the developer must provide to the local planning authority a written description of the proposed development including, amongst other things, the maximum height of the enlarged part of the

dwellinghouse. The description of the proposed development provided on the application form sets out that the maximum height of the extension would be 3 metres (m) in height from the natural ground level. While the Existing/Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations plan shows that the extension would have a height of 3m, there would be two roof lights that are shown to project above the 3m measurement. As such, there are inconsistencies between the maximum height provided on the application form and the maximum height of the proposed scheme that is shown on the submitted plan.

7. The appellant suggests that the maximum height referred to in GPDO paragraph A.4(2)(a)(ii) relates to the main structure of the extension and not the rooflights. However, there is no wording to this effect in GPDO Class A. Furthermore, The Permitted Development Rights for Householders Technical Guidance (2019) provides advice on calculating the height of the enlarged part of a dwellinghouse and states that this measurement should be at the highest part of the enlargement and may include any protrusions above the roof.
8. While the GPDO does permit the installation of roof lights, this is in relation to Class C and so the specific limits and conditions under that class do not apply to this appeal, which is made under Class A. The application satisfied the Council's validation requirements, nevertheless, this does not mean that the proposal would meet the conditions, limitations and restrictions that are applicable to the GPDO. Even if the projection of the roof lights in combination with the roof height would not result in the extension exceeding 4m in height, this does not negate the requirement for the maximum height of the proposal to be provided.
9. To conclude, there are discrepancies between the description of the proposal and what is shown on the submitted plans. As such a written description has not been provided that includes the maximum height of the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse and the requirements of GPDO paragraph A.4(2)(a)(ii) have not been met.
10. On this basis, the proposed development would not be granted planning permission by Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR